Maariv services last Sunday night and took lumch with me and my family yesterday. I was eager to learn from him about the situation in Palestine and to get his opinion as to what I could do toward getting the Zionist movement out of the blind-alley into which it finds itself at the present time.

His main contention is that the Zionist administration in Palestine has been inept in its dealings or lack of dealings with the local Arabs. Kirsh, Sprinzak, Miss Szold, Rabbi Berlin, Sacher and Mishkin have not manifested the least desire to work out some plan of cooperation with the Arabs. Instead of deploying some of the abler and more fiery spirits among the Arabs by giving them positions in some of the financial and industrial undertakings the Zionist administration fostered a spirit of Jewish chauvinism and a Western air of superiority which were bound to antagonize the natives. No attempt was made to enlist the aid of the sons of those who settled in Palestine thirty and forty years ago. They are looked down upon as being Levantinious and therefore unfit for any position of responsibility, and this despite the fact that these young men might have acted as intermediaries between the newcomers and the natives to establish some basis of cooperation.

In 1921 Joseph Levy was secretary to Storrs who was then governor of Jerusalem. At that time an Arab committee was preparing to go to London to ask for the abrogation of the Balfour Declaration. Kazim Pasha (?) was the head of that Committee. Not long after he secured or was given that position he confided to Joseph Levy that if he could get £ 2000 from the Zionist organization he and his committee would forget about their mission to London. Levy asked Storr's advice and the latter said by all means have that money turned over to Kazim and I will inform the home government why the committee which had made arrangements to come to London failed to appear." Levy went to see

Ussishkin and Ussishkin wouldn't even hear of the plan. The result was the committee went and although it didn't succeed in having the English Government revoke the Balfour Declaration, the Churchill White paper which was the outcome of the negotiations with the Committee did a great deal to mangle the Declaration.

But the greatest blunder of all committed by the Zionist Administration was to make a national issue out of the Wailing Wall question. The Arabic agitation against Zionism had been very much demoralized for lack of a definite issue and the Zionists provided that issue by insisting that the right to worship at the Wailing Wall was part of the Jews' right to a national center in Palestine. This furnished the Mufti with just what he needed to unite the Arab world against the Jews and to strengthen his own position.

Levy gave an account of the troubles that led to the riots. The place in front of the Wailing Wall was in charge of a Shamash who was a Sphardi and who had inherited his right from his father. Between them they held the ~~portion~~ position for about forty years. Recently an Ashkenazi realizing that there was a source of income to be exploited joined the Sephardic Shamash as a representative of the Ashkenazic community and put up a little table on which he placed little psalm books, oil lamps and similar articles for sale. A year ago last Yom Kippur there happened to come to Jerusalem a Hassidic "rebbi" (of Radzimir) who was intent upon praying all day before the Wailing Wall. Being displeased by the fact that the women who came to pray were not separated from the men according to the law, he asked the Shamash to put up a partition. The Shamash knew that such a partition was prohibited asked for L 30 from the "rebbi" to buy off such officials as might interfere with the putting up of the partition. Instead of using the money as he had promised he pocketed it all himself. The Arab ecclesiastic representing the Moroccan Mohammedans who have charge of the court in front of the

Wailing Wall asked the Shamash for 3 bakshish. The Shamash refused. Thereupon the Arab ecclesiastic went to the Mufti and told him about the partition. This started the trouble that later culminated in the riots. p.8

After discussing with him what action I should take we came to the conclusion that I should write out a statement which he would try to get into the N.Y. Times. It is up to me now to formulate the statement. Let me set down the main points:

1. We Zionists refuse to be stampeded into a panic by the Arab riots in Palestine or by the sabotaging of the Balfour Declaration in the Colonial Office of the English Government. We know that the riots have been maneouvered by a clique headed by the Mufti which has a vested interest in making trouble between Arabs and Jews. We know that the policy of sabotaging the Declaration is dictated by England's fear of losing India. We cannot expect the members of that Arab clique to listen to reason. We are confident that the natives will ultimately realize that their interests have been betrayed by these leaders and they will disown them. But of England we have a right to expect the ability to look beyond the immediate moment and to appreciate that even in the interest of its imperial integrity it is not wise policy to break a pledge. Germany certainly had the best of excuses for invading Belgium. Military necessity, the need of winning the war, dictated the policy of violating a pledge and treating a covenant as a scrap of paper. The immoral effect of treating the Palestine mandate as a scrap of paper is bound to act as a boomerang, apart from the mischief of fostering a spirit of cynicism toward all treaties among the fifty-two nations that constitute the League.

2. Two thousand years of suffering and waiting full of bitter disappointment and disillusionment has taught us not to be of those who sought "to precipitate the millenium." We view our movement as a long-

range proposition. We are prepared for a long series of patient efforts at getting the rest of the world which looks askance and ununderstandingly at our movement to realize what it is that makes the establishment of a Jewish national home the sine qua non of the soul salvation of sixteen million of our people. When men of accredited intelligence and commanding influence in the spiritual life of his country can display such crass ignorance of the Jewish religion and Jewish ideals throughout the centuries as to compare our aspiration for a national home to the Indians of Manhattan laying claim to Manhattan, then we can gauge the tremendous task ahead of us to inform and educate the general mind about our strivings.

3. The surest evidence of our self-possession even in these troublous days for our movement should be the ability to be self-critical and to see wherein we have failed to provide against the evils that have befallen us. We should not be afraid to ask ourselves the question "Has the Zionist administration in Palestine done all that it should to ward off the hostility which the handful of Arab leaders has been trying to instil in the nation population? Is it capable of so directing the movement as to prevent any recurrence of the riots?" If we are to be honest with ourselves and not try to live in a fool's paradise, we must admit the truth that the present administration has neither the point of view nor the mental equipment that can qualify it to deal with the realities of the Palestinian situation. One has to be obdurately impervious to the truth not to credit these leaders with having served Zionism when Zionism was in the making. But those who launch a course are seldom able to see it through. The mentality that went into the making of Zionism is totally out of place in Zion itself. In the making of Zionism the mind accustomed itself to dealing with Diaspora Jewry and foreign governments. In Zion the Jewish mind must learn to deal with the native population. The mind habituated to Zionism is on the whole disqualified for Zion.

The leadership necessary in the work of constructing a Jewish national home in Palestine must be based on a mentality which is not ~~xyxxx~~ tyrannized by bookish abstractions drawn from the logomachies waged in occidental halls of learning. Such leadership must possess the capacity to see in all its implications the indisputable reality that if Jews are to settle in Palestine they must do so on terms of cooperation with the three quarter of a million natives who are there to stay. To work out such a program of cooperation is no easy matter. The standards of Arab life and labor are low. Laissez- faire is bound to drive Jewish standards to the same low level. But the solution lies not in a self-protective aloofness, but rather in a studied effort so to cooperate as to create a desire in the Arab to rise to higher standards of living and working. This cannot come about in a day. Jewish capital should indicate a willingness to share opportunities with Arab capital and prove to Arab youth that ability wherever found in the Arab as well in Jew is giving a chance to a creative outlet. Jewish labor should make common cause with Arab labor in the effort to check the tendency in capital to indulge in greed and exploitation. To effect such a common understanding between two peoples with such different backgrounds and training as Jews and Arabs is a Herculean task, but so is the upbuilding of Zion, and none but those of Herculean strength should attempt it. We have such among us and it is to them that we must turn for help at this hour.

4. The incapacity of the present administration is perhaps most glaring in the complete lack of understanding of the oriental mind, a lack which accounts for their walking into the trap prepared by he Mufti and his clique. The least contact with oriental life should have convinced the Zionist administration that the last thing in the world a Jew can afford to do while seeking to establish himself in Palestine is to give even the scintilla of an excuse to a Mohammedan

for feeling that his religion has been slighted. However deeply ingrained may be the attachment of the traditionally minded Jew for the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem the Zionist organization should have been continually on guard to prevent the practice of praying at the Wailing Wall from becoming an issue between Jews and Arabs, even if the traditionally minded Jews had been inclined to do so. Instead the organization pursued the very opposite policy of giving the impression that there can be no Jewish national home without unrestricted right to pray before the Wailing Wall. What better proof could the Mufti want to convince the whole Mohammedan World that the holiest religious center outside of the one at Mecca was in danger of being violated by the Jews, and that the future of the Mohammedan religion demanded that the Jews must be kept out of Palestine?

* * *

Wednesday, June 4, 1930

The idea of having the members of the class in the School for Jewish Social Workers prepare papers on the various factors in Jewish life that make for integration is working out very well. Not only do the students learn more than if I had been lecturing to them but I myself gain a good deal more from the discussion that ensues than from the usual type of questions asked during the lecture period. The subject treated at today's session was anti-Semitism. While the paper itself was not as good as it might have been it helped me clarify my own ideas on anti-Semitism. The following is the substance of what I said on that subject.

In treating of the Jews' reaction to anti-Semitism we must differentiate between the reaction to the underlying motive of anti-Semitism and the reaction to the various rationalizations evolved by anti-Semitism. The underlying motive of anti-Semitism is the same for all forms of Jew hatred that have existed throughout history. The name

anti-Semitism, however, indicates not a new motive but a new type of rationalization for that motive.

The actual motive behind all forms of Jew hatred past and present is to be traced to a psycho-economic law of human nature which may be formulated as follows: It is natural for the individual human being to delimit or want to see delimited as far as possible the group that shares the resources essntial to his life and happiness, because the smaller the group the larger his share. All those who are so unmistakably alike or have so much in common with him that he can not or will not be permitted to deny their being of the same group with him/to have be accepted by him. But any one who displays a sufficient variation for him to be designated as outside of the group is immediately stigmatized as an outsider. That helps to delimit the group of those who share the resources. Since the Jews presented sufficient of a variation to be kept out of the groups with which they came in contact that variation was made the occasion for excluding the Jews whenever possible from desired economic resources. This economic basis of Jew hatred is far more helpful in enabling us to understand why Jews were always the victims of persecution, than the theory that the basis of Jew hatred is the dislike of the unlike. For even the dislike of the unlike, where it is not due merely to fear is traceable to the economic motive just explained.

But man has been ashamed of his economic motive almost as much as of his sex motive, especially when it has led him to anti-social acts. It assimilated him too much to the hog at the swill-trough snapping at his fellow hogs. Hence he would always seize upon the variation by which the one he wished to keep out was differentiated from him, and convince himself that the variation was of such a character as to unfit its possessor for sharing the resources, opportunites and privileges which were to be apportioned. During the Christian centuries the theory

of damnation of unbelievers supplied the necessary rationale. With the secularization of human institutions the theological rationalization of Jew hatred was played out, and in its place there was developed the theory of the Jews as an inferior race that corrupted the nation of which it became a part.

The reaction to the economic exclusion has been the segregation of Jews in large centers where even in the absence of social organization their very togetherness results in the intensification of Jewish life. Since their services are not wanted they are naturally forced to live off one another thereby becoming more Jew conscious. This effect far outweighs the disintegrating effect produced by economic exclusion.

The reaction to the rationalization is likewise bound to have an integrating effect because not only is the present-day rationalization so flimsy and malicious that is bound to call forth in the Jew a deepened sense of pride, but it is so virulent that it offers the Jew no escape but actual suicide. The Christian rationalization at least offered a way out baptism, but anti-Semitism brings the Jew at bay. From this position even the sceptical Jew is likely to fight for the right not only to live but to live as a Jew.

* * *

Thursday, June 5, 1930

This afternoon I participated in the march of protest against England's stoppage of immigration to Palestine. The march was preceded by a brief address by Wise delivered from an automobile on Madison Ave. cor. 25 St. I marched behind Wise. When I saw afterwards the line of march I was sorely disappointed at the small number and the conspicuous absence of any representative people.

* * *

Wednesday, June 18, 1930, West End, N.J., 469 Westwood Avenue. Arrived today

My moods are more fickle than the weather. At one moment as I read something that strikes my fancy I am exhilarated. I imagine that all I need is to put pen to paper and ideas would well forth like a gushing fountain. I find out soon enough that I was mistaken. It is not that I am devoid of any actual experiences worth discussing. What I lack is the power of articulation. Awareness of this limitation depresses me.

(It is impossible for me to write any more just now. Only a few feet away my sister-in-law Celia is talking to Lena in a voice that drowns out the inner voice of my thoughts.)

* * *

Thursday, June 19, 1930

It is almost two weeks that I have been struggling to formulate my ideas on the teaching of religion in the Jewish schools. I have to talk on that subject at the conference of Jewish educators next week. The main difficulty with every one of the subjects I have occasion to discuss is that I have to spend most of the time establishing a common understanding between the audience and myself concerning the principal basic ideas. The best informed among us are dominated by conventional notions and so long as that is the case all clear thinking is precluded. But this business of always having to go far afield and beginning ab initio is too much of a drain on my limited energy.

What I want to say is simple enough, if it weren't a question of garnishing it up and making a tasty dish of it. In the matter of ideas it seems that I make a pretty good farmer but a very poor cook. I can raise crops of them but find it torture to prepare a meal. The following is what I want to say:

Jewish education is inconceivable without reference to God. God or His Law is the central theme of practically all Jewish writings

before the nineteenth century, and religion is the central interest of all but the recent events of Jewish history. The teacher who is orthodox in his convictions has no problem to speak of as far as the subject matter of Jewish religion is concerned. That subject matter from his standpoint consists of the literature and history as they have come down from the past. The utmost amount of qualification necessary is that given by the medieval Jewish theologians. In an orthodox system of Jewish education religion is conceived as based upon theophanies which are presumed to be historical. That is essentially the religion of the texts and events which figure in the traditional Jewish education. In pre-enlightenment days probably one in a thousand found that religion to be in conflict with ideas acquired outside of Jewish education. Even that person did not become aware of such conflict before he was mature and well grounded in Jewish teaching and practice, and when he did find himself in the throes of a struggle between tradition and reason, he found reason comparatively easy to placate with what was formerly known as the double standard of truth.

Nowadays the position is reversed. Only one in a thousand is immune to the present day intellectual climate which is deadly to all religion that is based on theophanies and miracles. Children at the age of seven and eight begin to question the veracity of stories about miracles and certainly the majority of worthwhile Jewish teachers have long ago given up the traditional religious beliefs. With the majority of parents of children in Orthodox schools demanding the religion of theophany and miracle, what shall the modern-minded teacher do? The solution which he has arrived at is as ingenious as the double standard of truth adopted during the middle ages. It may describe in the words which Emerson used with regard to the English when he said "Their religion is quotation." The modern-minded teacher salves his conscience by completely depersonalizing himself and acting as a mere transmitter

of Jewish tradition. His argument is almost as ingenious as his theory. It is the function of Jewish education, he maintains, to expose the child to the influences of traditional Judaism and then let the child work out his won religious adjustment. Were we not teachers of this type, add instructed in the traditional conception of religion, and have we not had to work out our own spiritual adjustment?

The reasoning upon which that compromise is based is so fallacious that its true character as rationalization of what is perhaps economic necessity is all too apparent. What a diference between the exposure to which the teachers themselves were subject and he exposure to which their pupils have to submit. The teachers were brought up in an intensely Jewish atmosphere. Their teachers were fervent believers in tradition and taught with such conviction that their pupils could not but believe what they were taught, especially as there was little in the milieu of those pupils that was in conflict with tradition. But merely listening to statements made half-heartedly by the teacher of today in a manner that betrays disbelief will not influence as the child to remain a Jew. The actual effect of a Jewish education at present conducted is to leave the child in a state of mental confusion. He either intuitively realizes that what he is taught is not given to him as the vital convictions of his teachers, or he inwardly revolts at the demand made upon his credulity. Nothing having been given him as an alternative to the religion of theophany and miracle he grows up with a prejudice against all religion. The ablest Jewish children that are brought up in our so called religious schools generally regard themselves as in some way cheated by their Jewish schooling. There cannot be any worse indictment than that against any method or system of education and if Jewish education is subject to such indictment the blame rests with the policy of evasion that dominates the teaching of religion in our Jewish schools.

We shall hold on to this policy of evasion so long as the only kind of religion we know of is the religion of theophany and miracle and fail to recognize that there is such a thing as religion based on experience. It is futile merely to urge the abandonment of this policy. What we need is to develop religion in terms of experience and then to work out the details of pedagogic method whereby such religion is to be integrated in the Jewish training of the child. All I intend to do at present is to indicate in a general way the procedure that will have to be adopted if we mean to remove from Jewish education the sore spot of evasion and insincerity.

1. The Jewish teacher will have to achieve an affirmative orientation in religion in general and the Jewish religion in particular.

2. He will have to reconstruct the curriculum in order to make possible the teaching of religion in accordance with the new orientation.

3. Formerly when men found the religion of theophany and miracle untenable and yet felt that religion was somehow necessary to the full development of human life, they resorted to philosophic reasoning to reinstate the universal and eternal truths of religion. The modern man has an advantage over those to whom philosophy was the only means of basing their religion on experience. He has at his disposal the history and psychology of religious experience. The knowledge of the various manifestations of religion among peoples of different stages of development and of the forces of human nature both individual and collective that come into play in the manifold of religious beliefs and activities makes it possible for the modern man to discover what in every human being it is that expresses itself in religion in contrast with the religious philosopher who would make the basis of religion some universal idea which was intelligible only to the exceptional mind.

With the history and psychology of religious experience at our disposal we are in a position at the present time to distinguish in all religious experience which is of the pre-enlightenment type or stage two results, one putative and the other real. The putative result consisted of changes supposed to take place in the environment as a consequence of religious conduct or conduct in relation to some god or gods. The actual result has always been to invest some event, place thing, relationship, law or principle with such importance as to render significant or worthwhile life or the world as a whole, the individual human being and the group with which he is identified.

The effect of enlightenment has been to expose the unreality of the putative result and to indicate that the true means of effecting changes in the environment consists in knowing the nature of the things to be changed and so manipulating them as to have their natures function in the direction of the desired change. This is the function of science and invention. But the need of experiencing the significance and worthwhileness of life as a whole, of man and of the group cannot be met by science and invention. Whatever will meet that need will be the religion of the future. Religion of the future in eliminating that element in the religion of the past which has proved to be untenable and retaining that element which is tenable parallels the science of the stars which as astrology combined notions about their affecting the fate of human beings and the science of matter which as alchemy laid claims to the discernment of properties capable of being affected theurgic means.

From the point of view of the second and permanent function of primitive and historical religions it becomes evident that the specific ideas about God or gods, the creeds and formularies of different peoples and of each people in different stages of its development represent the articulation of the attitude of significance and worth-

whileness of the three objects mentioned in terms of the current general intellectual development.

It is therefore not merely as a philosophic or reasoned conception but as a generalization of actual religious experience that we are today in a position to state the minimum of what we mean by God. God is that power that renders the world, the individual and the group significant and worthwhile. The Atheist is not he who denies the traditional conception of God, but the one who denies the worthwhilenss of life as a whole. The term which is universally used in religion to express the experience of worthwhileness is holiness. While it is true that a goodly portion of the idea of holiness was reserved for tabus in reference to beings or objects believed to be the media through which the environment could be changed in accordance with the hearts' desire, a larger and larger area of the notion of holiness denoted the experience of high worth and importance apart from any use. In fact it was rather the feeling that here at last was something or person that was an end in itself or himself that led to the ascription of holiness, which in turn is an expression of the experience of life's worthwhileness.

That experience of significance or worthwhileness is an ultimate as the experience of beauty. In fact it is implied in the latter experience as it is also implied in he enjoyment we derive from truth for its own sake and from goodness that is without any ulterior motive. It is not conceivable that truth, goodness and beauty can make much of a difference most of all keenly appreciated by one who through some physical or defect or mental aberration can see nothing of value in life as a whole. As an ultimate this experience can best be described as a matter of faith since it is the major premise of every syllogism about the world the individual or the group. The thologians who tried to establish the existence of God by means of arguments from the nature

of the world, the individual overlooked the fact that if they had not assumed the worthwhileness of the world and the individual, they would never have thought of proving it and any one who is inclined to deny that worthwhileness no arguments would convince to the contrary.

The advantage of going behind the theological constructions to the experience of worthwhileness is the following. Theological constructions establishing the omnipotence, omniscience and perfect goodness of God are inevitably contradicted by the facts of life and instead of strengthening the belief in God only weakens it. Whereas the raison d'etre of the experience of worthwhileness is necessarily some fact to contradict it so that it thrives on contradictions, as it were. Not, e.g., the argument in $J_o b$. This accounts for the intuition of common sense that religion's worst enemy is theology.

Religion will be revitalized but not through some supernatural theophany, nor through some clever dialectic but through the realization that the root of religious as well as the higher life of man in general is the experience of worthwhileness of the three concentric circles of ones's life, the self, the group and life as a whole. The wickedness of injustice and impurity consists in their begetting that contempt of all sanctities which is the root of despair of life in general. Thus viewed we can understand more clearly and accurately the relationship between religion and morality. Instead of speaking of religion as the sanction of morality, which way of speaking makes that relationship a logical one, we should regard the experience that finds expression in religion implicit in morality. But so it is also in art and the appreciation of nature's beauty. This identifies the relationship as psychological.

A further analysis of the experience of significance or worthwhileness discloses the fact that such experience is the concomitant of

self-consciousness in the sense that with the increase of human self-consciousness (especially the consciousness of death) the need for the experience of worthwhileness is intensifed. The failure of nerve which generally accompanies progress is the failure of that experience to prove commensurate with the deepened self-consciousness that all progress brings. As a rule all progress invalidates the traditional expression of religion, and unless some new form compatible with the new world outlook is achieved human life and institutions begin to deteriorate. National, race and individual suicide become prevalent and the civilization where this progress takes place soon becomes moribund.

It is evident that from the standpoint of education as a means of developing thecomplete personality of the child the aim of his education should be to develop his capacity to find the world, the individual and the group signfficant and worthwhile.

The Jewish teacher as a rule comforts himself with the thought that he has succeeded in arousing in the child an interest in and attachment to the Jewish people. If that is all he has accomplished he has merely implanted in the child another patriotism, which though an incipient form of religion is the easiest to inculcate, and which when not supplemented by the realization of worthwhileness in life as a whole and in the individual human being as such is only too liable to become the last refuge of the ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ scoundrel.

As an integral phase of the affirmative orientation on the part of the teacher in religion in general is the need of his reorienting himself in Jewish religion in particular. One who has abandoned the traditional conception of the origin of Jewish religion cannot have any interest in that religion, much less possess that love for it to be qualified to teach it to others unless he undergoes a complete re-education first in the history of the Jewish religion with modern times, and second in the relation it must henceforth occupy to religion as a whole.

As for the history of the Jewish religion, there is a crying need for some one to organize and interpret the objective results of biblical scholarship cultivated for the most part by Christian scholars results oft vitiated by the Christian bias which those scholars have injected into them. It is regrettable that Jewish scholarship should have yielded to the fear of offending popular Jewish opinion and have refrained from applying itself to the Jewish religion which after all has been the nucleus of Jewish life. Lacking any systematic presentation of the history of the Jewish religion the average Jewish teacher cannot possibly be qualified for his task. The fault is certainly not his. It seems to me hat the conscientious teachers ought to feel this lack so keenly that they would plead with those who are in a position to be of help to put a moratorium on other and more remote objects of research in the Jewish past, and devote themselves to the task of giving an honest matter of fact presentation of the Jewish religion, a presentation that would offer an understandable account or hypothesis of how the Jewish religion really began and developed, that what answer such questions as the following: What part did the prophets play in changing the conception of God? What were the religious ideas of the Jews during the Second Temple and how did they come by them? What have been the dominant religious ideas during the many centuries since the destruction of the Second Temple?

* * *

Friday, June 20, 1930

The reeducation called for by the relation which the Jewish religion must henceforth hold to religion as a whole is due to the radical change which has taken place with regard to religion as a means of salvation. Salvation whether we take it to mean as life eternal or complete self-fulfillment was hitherto regarded as attainable only by those who were in possession of the true religion. It

was assumed, of course, that there could be only one true religion, namely, the religion which was based upon the last and most authoritative revelation of God's will. The exclusive eligibility to salvation of the one group of believers who were in possession of the true religion was the corollary of the religion of theophany and miracle combined with monotheism. It was as much an axiom of the Jewish as it was of the Christian and the Mohammedan religion.

In the future a religion will have to be based upon experience. This implies that a group which will express its life, its memories and aspirations in terms of religion will seek to establish the validity of its religion by upholding its universal character, by demonstrating wherein it conforms with the universal principles of human experience. The particularity of the religion will not consist in the profession of some truth or teaching that is necessarily denied by the religion of some other group, but in the fact that the experience upon which are based and in terms of which are expressed the teachings and practices of a particular religion are drawn from the life of the group professing that religion. Some such understanding of the mutual relations of religions to one another is indispensable to those who themselves adhere to and seek to get others to adhere to their inherited religion in an age such as ours when religious tolerance has come to be adopted as an ehtical standard and not merely as apolitical necessity.

A more serious difficulty than achieving a new religious orientation is translating it into educational practice. The difficulty resides mainly in the resistance with which the teaching in accord with a new religious orientation is likely to meet on the part of the general public who are more conservative in matters of religion than in any other phase of life. Great as that resistance is it is no excuse for continuing with the present educational procedure whereby the very ends of Jewish education are bound to be defeated, and the child

is least likely to be in any sense the gainer. If we are convinced that our present attitude of evasion must lead to moral chaos no amount of opposition and no degree of suffering should deter us from battling for what are the true interests of the child and of the Jewish people. My purpose at present, however, is not to devise the necessary strategy for the war against obscurantism and the distortion of the mentality and character of the Jewish youth but to suggest by what means we may hope to enable the child to adjust himself to life in a manner that is affirmatively spiritual.

In the first place it is necessary to aim at developing in the mind of the child a distinction between history, religious folklore and religion. It is impossible to expect that in the Jewish education of the child the teaching of the narrative parts of the Bible should be postponed to an age when he might have it taught to him in its proper historic setting and place in religious development. The stories of the Bible are so much a part of the world culture that one who receiving any kind of education can scarcely avoid them, even though one may have a confused idea about them. But it is just this ubiquitousness of those stories without their contents being properly defined that causes hem to be wrongly identified as typical of all that religion has to offer. Since as a rule even the vague knowledge of those stories is complicated by doubts as to their historicity the case for disqualifying them and with them religion as such is for the average person fully made out. The least we should do should be to make provision against this series of false identifications which prejudice the minds of the growing generation against religion. It appears to me that the very ground would be removed from under such prejudice if the child were imbued with the idea that not everything taught in the Jewish school is meant to be religion, nor even that the Bible stories are religion. Just as the non-Jewish school has in its educational

content three distinct heads for history, literature and civics, though sometimes the same material may be found under all the three heads, so should the Jewish school emphasize the distinction between history, religious folklore and religion by teaching each as a separate subject despite the fact that a good deal of the same material may have to be included under each subject. The treatment as we shall indicate presently will be so different that the identity of the material need be no more reason for treating it only under one heading than the fact that a tree described in a poem is also discussed in botany is a reason for teaching poetry and botany together.

It is true that we should avoid especially in the earlier years of education the tendency to specialization in subject matter. The teaching of history, geography and literature by means of projects that call for interest in all the three subjects simultaneously. By the same token is it advisable to combine in the curriculum of the Jewish school the teaching of language with that of religious folklore and religious folklore with that of general folklore? But when it is essential as it is today to establish in the mind of the child the habit of differentiating between what our ancestors believed and what we have to believe and to do that at a time when the child is not mentally ready to grasp such afact as change in beliefs, we have to resort to a method which reckons with the immaturity of the child, yet has its effect when maturity is attained. The threefold division of Jewish subject matter into history, folklore and religion will accomplish that purpose.

Those were indeed a revolutionary changes in Jewish education when the study of Bible and Jewish history were differentiated from the study of Rabbinics which until modern times constituted the sole content of Jewish knowledge. I say advisedly differentiated from Rabbinics, because when the Jew studied Rabbinics he studied Bible and got his

information concerning the poast of his people. That method of training knowledge conformed to the best pedagogic ideal of having educational subject matter as nearly synthesized as life itself. But when it became apparent that the contents of the Bible have a meaning known as Peshat which is practically ignored in the Rabbinics, and the Bible came to be studied by scholars from that point of view, then Jewish education had to make room for Bible as distinct from Rabbinics. Likewise when it became apparent that Rabbinics gave a very limited and distorted view of Jewish history and scholars devoted themselves to the rewriting of Jewish history, Jewish history attained a distinct position in the training of the Jewish child.

But unfortunately this process of differentiation has stopped half-way. The teaching of Jewish history reflecting what is even today presented by scholars as Jewish history is still very largely marred by the inclusion of what is merely folklore, and the teaching of the Bible is regarded as doing duty for the teaching of religion when it is evident that some of themost conspicuous ideas are the Bible can no longer do service as workable religious or ethical truth. What I urge is merely that the pocess of abject differentiation which was begun against the views of the traditionalists and carried on despite their violent resistance, be carried to such conclusions as will finally adapt the literary content of Jewish life to the intellectual and spiritual needs of today, and that these conclusions be paralleled in Jewish education.

It is therefore not merely as a pedagogic device that I plead for the recognition as distinct phases of Jewish subject matter of history, religious folklore and religion, but as a means of having Jewish education reckon with the new world outlook. The interest that naturally accrues to a subject which is relevant to life and thought is more than likely to counterbalance whatever pedagogic sin be committed in the treatment of it as a separate subject.

Saturday night, June 21, 1930

Instruction in history should not begin before the child is ripe enough to grasp the meaning of collective life and of evolution. If it be found advisable to begin such a course by means of biographies of outstanding characters in Jewish history, it must be remembered that in that case Samuel would have to be the first whose biography could be said to be historical. We have been so accustomed to associate religion with dogmatic affirmation that we fail to appreciate the marvelous spiritual influence on the child's mind of the effort on our part to distinguish between fact and fiction. A new day will dawn for religion when it will become associated in men's minds with the habit of intellectual honesty.

It is in the teaching of history that the opportunity presents itself of weaving into the account of the life of the Jewish people the story of the origin and development of the Jewish religion. If we mean what we say when we continually harp upon the Jewish contribution to religion as being its chief asset then we ought to live up to what we say by giving the children as vivid a picture as possible of how that religion came into being. In former generations the literal acceptance of the truth of theophany and miracle helped to establish in the mind of the child our claim to superiority in the matter of religion. Nowadays the part played by our ancestors in the advancement of religion must be presented by means of the historical reconstruction which scholars in the main agree on. To illustrate, instead of treating as historical the biblical interpretation of the idolatrous tendencies of Israel of the first Commonwealth as a retrogression and wilful rebellion against a divinely revealed code, that interpretation should be regarded as the result of a point of view which was possible before there was such a thing as a historic consciousness when people projected their own standards into the past that had preceded their own age, and the

actual fact that during the period of the First Commonwealth our ancestors went through a process of growth from crude beginnings to an ethical monotheism.

The teaching of religious folklore should be distinguished from the teaching of history not only in the nature of the content but chiefly in the type of approach. All that comes under the head of folklore should be treated as poetry and as the product of the imagination. The child nowadays is told in the course of his general education stories concerning which it never occurs to him to ask whether they were true or not. Although the division between fact and fiction is for him rather vague especially in his younger years, as soon as that division begins to be clearly perceived by him those stories which were not intended as an account of actual happenings fall easily into the category of legend or myth without his having to go through the process of mental struggle and readjustment. It is that very struggle and readjustment that we must spare the child when we teach him any of the narrative parts in which God figures as a participant or as interlocutor. All these facts must be given to the child as ancient religious folklore not as historic fact. Why should not the child realize that the Greek myths he studies at school are the religious folklore of the Greeks. Our ancestors had likewise stories in which they tried to express their religious beliefs. But while the Greek myths have one kind of beauty, the Jewish myths have a different kind of beauty. If the stories of creation, the flood, the patriarchs, Moses, Israel in the wilderness, etc. were told in this spirit there would be once and for all an end to that mental conflict which has alienated our youth from the Jewish religion.

* * *

Sunday, June 22, 1930

But neither the history of the Jewish religion nor Jewish religious folklore constitutes religion. Those two subjects are necessary merely to clear the ground for the teaching of religion proper so that it be unencumbered by misconceptions. Religion proper consists not in talking or thinking about what other people believed, felt or acted but in personal experience. The problem before us is how to elicit from the child of today the kind of religious experience which makes for growth of personality and capacity for wholesome self-adjustment to life. Recalling that religion is essentially the experience of the worthwhileness and significance of reality as a whole of the individual human being and of the group to which one belongs our task is to foster in the child these phases of worthwhileness and significance. We are evidently confronted with a task similar to that of fostering in the child an appreciation of the beautiful in nature and in the arts. The initial step is to establish some point of contact in the inner life of the child to which we might transfer whatever of worthwhileness or significance we ourselves are able to discover. That point of contact is presented by the inherent capacity for thankfulness. It is as impossible for a person who is devoid of a native sense of gratitude to have religious experience as it is for the tone deaf to appreciate music. It is the capacity for thankfulness which enables a person to discern elements of worthwhileness and significance in life. Fortunately the average child possesses it to a sufficient degree to serve as starting point for the training in religion.

The training in religion may be divided into two parts, instruction and practice. The instruction should consist mainly of discussion between the teacher and class. Where the purpose is to produce not merely verbal knowledge but inner experience of some kind text books are out of question, because inner experience can be called

forth only by the teacher establishing a point of contact with the actual knowledge and interests of the child. The purpose of the discussion should be 1) to articulate the feeling of thankfulness; 2) to socialize it and 3) to relate it to the conception of God.

These three purposes are not to be thought of as disparate aims but as constituting the elements indispensable to the translation of the capacity for thankfulness into religious experience. To articulate the feeling of thankfulness is to get the child to identify the specific facts in his experience he has reason to be grateful for. In order to enable each child to express himself fully and frankly it might be advisable to have them state in writing the things they actually and truly feel grateful for. It might even be necessary to resort to anonymity in order to break down all barriers of embarrassment. The teacher should then take up each specific statement and point out some of the larger relationships and implications of that which the child mentions as the object that evoked his gratitude. Let us say the child is thankful that he got a new suit. This should be an occasion for the teacher to point out some of the elements in that network of material labor exchange and good will which has made it possible for his parents to buy him the suit. All the knowledge that the child acquires in his general training should be brought into play in the process of articulating and deepening the experience of gratitude.

It is evident that it would be dangerous to emphasize the child's thankfulness for having his new suit without reminding him that there are numerous children whose parents cannot afford to buy for them new suits. A sense of thankfulness for the advantages one enjoys without sympathetic realization of the many who are deprived of that advantage begets a self complacency that is more offensive than ingratitude. To prevent any such self complacency from gaining headway the teacher should point out that the thankfulness which the little boy feels on

account of his having gotten a new suit would remain a mere form of selfish indulgence unless it found an outlet in some kindly act or act of rectification so that when he will grow up he will be able to do his share toward widening the scope of human welfare.

After a while the child should be gotten to experience thankfulness not only for the good that accrues to him individually, but to all those to whom he is related by ties of blood and friendship. Gradually as the circle of social self identification is enlarged through his general studies and contacts it is important that thankfulness for the good fortune enjoyed by those with whom the child learns to identify himself should be articulated and socialized. An example of that is the victorious outcome of a war about which he may have learned in the history of his country.

In the hands of an able teacher the child's capacity for thankfulness and for converting that thankfulness into creative energy will come to feed not only upon the limited range of the child's own life, but upon the wealth of human attainment which man has built up as a dyke to keep out the limitless chaos that threatens to engulf him. The entire range of things true, good and beautiful will come to be appreciated by the child in a spirit that will compel him to add to their sum in accordance with the gifts that are his. It is in this connection that the teacher will have occasion to place all outstanding individuals and movements that help to render life worthwhile in such a light as to enable the child to see in them the true index of what human life should strive to be and do.

Parallel with the widening of the relationships and implications of the objects that elicit gratefulness will be the deepening of the conception of God which will not be given to him in catechismic form, but in the form of ever renewed restatement. In each such restatement the teacher will have to counteract the tendency to anthropor-

morphism and to accustom the mind of the child to associate a sense of reality with those tendencies in the world that call for and justify human gratitude. Conceived as belonging to the one organically interrelated world those tendencies in their togetherness constitute God. How all religions in general and the Jewish religion in particular have approximated this conception of God would naturally form an important part of these discussions after the pupil has become habituated to this kind of presentation of religious ideas.

Should it be said that it is impossible to expect of the average teacher who is used to having his subject matter all set out for him in text books and divided into lessons and who is helpless the moment he has to work out the subject matter himself, the answer is that the teaching of religion should not be entrusted to the average teacher. There is no reason why the average teacher should be expected to teach a subject which requires considerable specialization. We have special teachers for music and for artsandcrafts. The mastery of the main results of research in the field of religion and the communication of it to others to say nothing of the possession of a special temperament and happy combination of sense of reality, a poetic sense and a highly ethical disposition, are possible only to those who would specialize in the science and pedogogy of religion. It would be a happy consequence of these our deliberations if they would have the effect of persuading rabbinical institutions to train their graduates in religion and a still happier consequence if they would ultimately induce men and women who devote themselves exclusively to teaching to qualify themselves as teachers of religion with that same concentration and attention to pedagogic details as those who qualify as teachers of a subject like music or the arts.

The instruction of religion must culminate in religious practice. Apart from the translation of the sense of thankfulness or

of worthwhileness into conduct in all its aspects, a process which must be left to each child to work out for himself, it is necessary to train the child to translate that sense into the practice of worship. In the light of the distinction that we have drawn between religion of the past and the religion of the future, worship will henceforth not be used as a means of petitioning God as though he were a benevolent despot to grant us favors, to bring into existence such environmental conditions as are entirely beyond our control. Worship will have but the one function, that of imbuing us with the God consciousness, or the consciousness of life's worthwhileness. It will therefore express itself as it has expressed itself in all highly developed religion, namely in words and gestures of "tehillah" rather than "tefillah" of praise rather than of prayer. Worship is a sense of worthwhileness in action. That sense to become so potent as to function in times of stress and temptation must be cultivated by practice. Religious ceremonies and religious service. The teaching and discussion of life's worth is after all confined to the hour of instruction, the experience of it is necessary at every moment of the day and every day of one's life. Hence the need of frequent acts of affirmation of the active principle that gives meaning to human existence. This is the function of the benedictions which formed part of the religious regimen of the Jew. If we do not deem it necessary as did the traditionalist to recite a hundred benedictions a day, the recital of some benedictions in the spirit of religion as we have interpreted it is spiritually rewarding. There is always the argument that routine deadens spontaneity, and the purely mechanical religiosity of the masses is held up as a warning of what the practice of such a religious device is likely to degenerate into. It is forgotten however that mechanical religiosity was the concomittant mainly fo the traditional conception and practice of religion, when religion was for the masses a form of theurgy, and there

and there was supposed to reside in inherent virtue in the religiousact apart from the awareness of the one who performed it as to any meaning it was to have for him. Deprecating as we do any religion but that which is translated into terms of conscious experience, we have no fear that outward gesture will reduce the awareness of that experience.

But it is especially through religious service, participated in by large numbers of children, that the spirit of thankfulness which is the form in which the child's sense of life's worthwhileness/first takes can achieve that expression which will make religion a vital and interesting experience to him. It is through religious service that Jewish education should bring to bear upon the child all of those factors which influence not by means of ideation but by means of emotional impressiveness. All the artistic skills of the children should be enlisted in rendering religious service an occasion of joyous self-expression on the part of the children, in which the joy emanates not from the animal spirit of the child but from that distinctively human trait of religious thankfulness. We do not in the least deprecate the joy which comes from the animal spirits, but we certainly need also the other which has its roots in the higher potentialities of the child. The distinctive mark of the latter kind of joy is that instead of expressing itself in hilariousness it expresses itself in the attitude of reverence. It is thus that we may hope to implant in the child a reverence which is genuine because it is an outgrowth of his own religious experience.

All this implies the need of organizing religious services for the children as an integral part of their Jewish training. To expect them to develop genuine religious experience of the kind that is compatible with our present ideas of religion by participating in adult services is to fly in the face of all pedagogic principles. We have no right to draw any inferences from the influence exercised on children in former generations by the public worship of adults, for then the

atmosphere was charged with the spirit of theurgy, and the influence was one which simply subdued or frightened the child into the vague fear of an anthropomorphic god. So long as people enjoyed having that kind of religion adult worship was the best thing for the child. But since the average adult service today has lost the spirit of theurgy and has so far evolved nothing to take its place, the child is merely bored and is forced to attend is so fed up that as soon as he leaves his parents' home he gives the synagogue a wide berth.

From the standpoint of the need of revitalizing the element of religion in Jewish life, there is little hope that it will be possible to do very much with the adult. It is only a new generation brought up to look upon religion not as a matter of unassimilated and irrelevant tradition but of personal experience in which whatever tradition enters is related to the whole of one's outlook, that will be qualified to carry through the great spiritual reformation which Jewish life must undergo if it is to justify itself to the millions of Jews who are fated to remain in the Diaspora.

* * *

Friday, June 24, 1930

On Friday, June 6 I went to see a physician (Dr. Simon Ruskin of 351 West 86 St.) about my right ear which seemed stopped up and caused a peculiar sensation in my head when I spoke. My ear annoyed me considerably when I had to deliver a sermon, making it quite difficult for me to concentrate my mind on what I was speaking. That condition of the ear had lasted about two weeks when I thought that it was time for me to have it attended to. Several treatments which the physician gave me have done it good. I also want to record that I have been taking the hay fever treatment regularly about twice a week and that I have not been troubled by hay fever since the attack during the last week in April.

Dr. Ruskin's wife was formerly a Miss Reder. She was graduated from the Teachers Institute about twelve years ago. She has a good mind and a wagging tongue. When I came to see her husband about my ear she met me and irritated me with her conversation in which she quoted Max Stemer as saying that I had gone to his house to persuade him to become Orthodox and that I turned out to be a faker. I lost my temper and asked her to do me a favor and tell him in my name that he is not only a liar but a damned liar. As usual I was sorry afterwards that I got myself into such a huff because of a woman gab quoting the opinion of a man for whom I have always had the profoundest contempt. Will I ever learn to maintain my poise in spite of provocation? I do not give up all hope, because I have begun to show signs of self control recently. In my work with the SAJ I have learned to speak calmly whenever the members of the Board show a tendency to cut out small but essential items in the budget affecting the educational work. And at the Sabbath services a week ago Saturday as I was speaking to a Bar Mizvah boy (Kreeger) some one made it his business to talk in a loud voice over the telephone in the office which is in the balcony of the synagogue. He talked so loud that I could hear what he said. In former days when anything like that happened I would pour forth all the vials of my wrath on the audience. This time, however, I went right on ignoring the interruption completely.

Perhaps I have no right to lay unction to my soul for these recent displays of self control. It may be due to the fact that the panicky condition which prevails at the present time has made me fearful of letting myself go lest it furnish the few people who are still taking a slight interest in things Jewish in spite of their financial losses an excuse for becoming completely disinterested. I am afraid to think that I have come to need the SAJ so badly that I have become wary of what I say to a member of trustee. How difficult it is to know

what attitude one should take in the matter of being true to oneself. Take, for instance, the speech which Semel made at the banquet last Wednesday at Hotel Commodore, given by the Jewish Education Association in honor of the National Council for Jewish Education. If he were not a trustee, and if I had no scruples about offending him I should have availed myself of the first opportunity to tell him exactly what I thought of that speech in which he went out of his way to attack Benderly and me because we dared to suggest to the Jewish Education Assocation what it ought to do to justify its existence. But Semel is now a trustee of the SAJ. I have encouraged his winning for himself a position of importance and influence in the organization. I shall therefore have to exercise a great deal of self-restraint and not say a word to him about his speech.

But what's the good of being true to oneself if it lead to quarrels and misunderstandings? It does seem sometimes that the world would be a great deal better off under a regime of enlightened selfishness than under one dominated by the ideal of being true to oneself regardless of consequences. The essence of enlightenment is to know a thing in terms of causes and consequences.

During the second week of June I went through the usual routine of attending the Graduation exercises of the Seminary and addressing both the alumni of the Teachers Institute and the Israel Friedlaender classes. Except for Davidson's address which was rather witty, the graduation exercises were as always a mental torture to me. I had to listen to an address by Stroock who is now chairman of the Board of Directors of the Seminary. Except for the few introductory sentences, it was the same address he had delivered a few days before at the graduation exercises of the JIR which I understand had been carried out with a great deal of pomp and impressiveness. At a celebration by the JIR

the public is represented by a number of interested outsiders. At our affairs no outsider is ever seen. The only people that attend the commencement exercises are the relatives of the graduates and students.

It is remarkable how confused even intelligent laymen can be about religion. What Stroock said concerning the modern perplexities in religion and concerning what the laity expected of the religious leader was a hodge podge of contradictions and misunderstandings. I was grateful though for one thing that I learned about from his address; the recent publication by Teachers College of a study of the Idea of God in Protestant Religious education. It stimulated me in the preparation of the paper on the teaching of religion in Jewish schools (pp.13-29).

The addresses I gave at the alumni gathering on Sunday, June 8 and at the Siyum Ha zman of the IFC were successful, despite the disheartening aspect of both those gatherings. The small attendance on both occasions is undoubtedly symptomatic of a waning interest in the TI and what it is trying to do and a falling off in the demand for Jewish knowledge on the part of the Jewish youth. At the Siyum Hazman I nagged the life out of Chipkin to get him to give up the IF classes and to let me use the money for the education of high school boys from whom we might get material for the Teachers Institute. I imagine that he failed to put in as much effort into the class as he had put in during previous years. But whatever the cause for the poor showing I was very much disgruntled and was not going to speak, but at the last moment I changed my mind and gave part of the talk I had delivered at the SAJ services during the winter on the Will to Live as Jews, in which I made use of the play Death Takes a Holiday as a parable for my theme.

* * *

Sunday, June 29, 1930

Having been scheduled to take part in the conference of the National Council for Jewish Education which took place last week, I worked out the paper which is found in this journal (pp. 13-29). I had to read it Wednesday morning, June 25, but I came to New York the evening preceding in order to hear what Prof. Kilpatrick of Teachers College would have to say on the theme which was closely related to the one I was to discuss in my paper, "The Inadequacy of Science." I thought God knows what new revelation Kilpatrick was to bring to the Conference. I should have known by this time that nothing new can ever come forth from T.C. but it is this miserable sense of inferiority, the hardest thing in the world to down, that always makes me forget that there is nothing I can learn from these cud-chewers. All that he gave was merely a rehash of Whitehead's discussion of Newton's mechanistic conception of the universe with its dualism of mind and matter resulting finally in outright materialism and of what may be found in any elementary text book in philosophy on the concept of value. As an introductory lecture to a course in Philosophy 2, what he said might have been passable, but as an address to men who are supposed to be educators and specialists to boot, it was an insult.

But a Goy has mazal - especially with us Jews. A thing of duty is a "goy" forever is what I wrote down on a card I passed to Rabbi Brickner, as I was listening to Kilpatrick. Even before K. rose to speak Rosen, the president of the Council in the address which he delivered referred to what he considered the two main sources of inspiration in guidance to which the members of the Council were indebted, the late Louis Marshall and Teachers College. He described Marshall as the one Jewish personality who has done more than any one else in American Jewry to promote Jewish education, and Teachers College as having given a philosophy and direction to all Jewish

educational effort. I do not recall the exact words, but this was the spirit of what Ben Rosen said. B. Rosen is a very nice chap, but no one would ever charge him with much knowledge, profound understanding or unusual ability. But with no one to challenge his statements, they are likely to become part of public opinion by virtue of his position as educational director of the Jewish schools in Philadelphia. I would certainly be grieved to see such undeserved tributes as he paid to Marshall and the Teachers College become part of public opinion. History is no fairer in its awards than life. After all, history is nothing more than what historians make it.

It took me one and three quarter hours to get through with my paper on Wednesday morning at the Jewish Club, 23 W. 73 St. It was considered a good paper by the majority of those present. Rabbi Landesman who always manages to rub me the wrong way, said he agreed with the first part of my talk, but not with the second. This Rabbi Landesman is a graduate of the Seminary of some years standing, whom somehow I could not win over to my views despite his apparent liberalism. I imagine that it is rather some temperamental difference that divides us. There must be something about me which he does not like, principally, I believe, the fact that I am not eminently successful in the promulgation of my ideas. His is what I would call the success or bandwagon psychology. The unsuccessful must be wrong.

Has it often happened that even a successful effort of mine should come off without regrets? My regrets this time were due to my not having prepared an excerpt of my talk for publicity purposes. The penalty of this omission was to see a few inanities appear in the Jewish Daily Bulletin as the substance of my address. Another source of regret is the fact that when Dushkin insisted upon my giving him the paper for the Educational Quarterly which he edits, I had to tell

him the truth that the reason I could not give it to him was that I wanted/it to appear first in the book I was writing for the Rosenwald contest. What a stupid thing for me to have said! In the first place, I am doubtful about my being able to enter the book in the contest because I am completely bewildered as to what we Jews should really do, and secondly I am dubious about submitting my work to a committee which includes such judges as Prof. Isaacs and Lee K. Frankel the/former definitely prejudiced against me and my views and the latter completely entangled in the Reform psychology.

I derived but little spiritual pleasure from the two banquets which the Council for Jewish Education was tendered last Wednesday, one a luncheon and the other a banquet. At the luncheon which was tendered by Vogelstein, representing the Union of Hebrew Congregations, Vogelstein read a little speech which despite its brevity, had enough to show how completely befuddled the leading man in the Reform laity are about the whole business of Jewish life and education. I am beginning to believe that the greatest difficulty with being a Jew is knowing what it is to be a Jew.

At the dinner which was tendered by the JEA I was called upon to speak without having been told beforehand. Fortunately I know enough never to come to a public occasion without an idea or two in my head in case I am called upon, but as the exercises proceed and the likelihood of my being called upon grows less, I relax and give no further thought to what I might have to say. When, therefore, Mosesohn the toastmaster introduced me, I was not sufficiently taut to do as well as I would have liked to. What I had to say wasn't so bad, but it could have been a whole lot better. More regrets.

The thing I must keep in mind whenever I have occasion to speak before people who are identified with an organization, is to be gracious and appreciative of what they are tyring to accomplish to throw realism to the winds and to idealize the organization, in other words, to lay on the compliments thick. People say so much about catching flies with honey instead of vinegar, but is not the purpose of catching flies to get rid of them? If I was sure we could get rid of a few people in the community by means of flattery, I would make it my business to become an expert flatterer.

I have already referred (p. 30) to Semel's tirade against Benderly's speech that evening. I must confess that after the talk Semel had with me yesterday morning I could not help admitting that Semel was right, although I still think Semel should not have made that kind of a speech. The fact is, (Ibid) Benderly is a hard man to work with, an autocrat who is wrongheaded. If I forgive him the injury he is doing to the Teachers Institute and therefore to me it is because I believe him to be sincere and selfless in his wrongheadedness. But that does not minimize the fact that he has obstructed the progress of Jewish education in this country though he was the one to give it the initial impulse twenty years ago. The good that some people do in this world furnishes them with the license to do enough mischief to more than counterbalance the good they have done.

* * *

Wednesday, Judy 16, 1930

I have been steadily at work the last few weeks on Judaism as a Civilization and could not get myself to spend time on anything else. This accounts for my allowing so long an interval to elapse without making any entries into the journal. Except for a day or two of depression caused by articles in this month's Harper's and Atlantic Monthly dealing with Zionism and unemployment, I have on the whole been

in a contented frame of mind. On days like yesterday and today when the weather was ideal and I was able to work uninterruptedly from early morning till late at night except for swimming and occasional walks, I tasted the bliss of serenity.

Last Friday (July 11, 1930) I converted to Judaism Miss Yvonne Laget. Dr. Joshua Finkel and Samuel Dinin acted as witnesses The ceremony and the immersion took place at the YWHA building on West 110 St.

In the afternoon I officiated at Miss Laget's marriage to Max Spielberg at 1 West 81 St. Everything went off well that day.

* * *

Tuesday, July 22, 1930

Yesterday as I was returning to West End I met Moses Hadas on the train. He is a graduate of the Seminary of the class of 1928. Instead of entering the ministry he has been teaching Greek, first at Columbia then at Cincinnati College, and now again at Columbia. Not long after he was graduated he married a daughter of Abraham Elkus, having met her in Wise's Sunday School where he and she taught.

The Elkuses belong to the well to do German Jewish stock who hang on to Judaism by a sheer thread. Hadas told me a number of facts about the attitude of these people toward Judaism which made me very unhappy.

First he told me about himself. As long as he lived in Cincinnati he was able to have something of a Jewish atmosphere in his home. But now that he stays with the Elkuses although in a separate cottage on the estate at Red Bank, he has had to hang up his Hebrew Diploma from the Seminary to have something Jewish about the house. He knows how to blow the shofar. So another Jewish ornament is a shofar on the wall.

Then he asked me whether a Dr. Hess who lives opposite the SAJ House, a well known physician who is on the Faculty of the ? p.35 ever came to the services. Hess is a brother of Mrs. Elkus, Hadas' mother in law. Hadas had spoken to Hess about me with the hope of getting him interested in Judaism. This Hess is the only one in his wife's family who seems to have any intelledtual interests. Although he is highly cultured, he is entirely estranged from Judaism.

Hess's wife is a daughter of the late Isidore Straus who was drowned on the Titanic. When a daughter (?) of theirs was to be married she would not permit a rabbi to officiate at the wedding. She insisted on having a judge, and preferably a Gentile, officiate. The parents of the groom, who still retain some Jewish sentiments, were quite distressed about the matter. A compromise was reached by having Judge Cardozo officiate.

The reason Hadas has been accepted by his wife's family and even by this Mrs. Hess is that his little girl is a perfect blonde Nordic type.

* * *

Wednesday, July 23, 1930

Hadas said that before he married into the Elkus family he naively assumed that that type of German Jews objected to intermarriage. He now realizes he was entirely mistaken. He mentioned as an instance a young man by the name of Bijur who is a cousin of the Judge Nathan Bijur who died recently. This young man does law work for Elkus and has known the family very well. He would occasionally take out a daughter of Elkus, a younger sister of Hadas' wife. Every one in the Elkus family including of bourse the young lady herself, who is beautiful and well educated, were anxiously hoping that he would declare himself. It was an ideal match from every standpoint. Yet he got engaged to a gentile girl, quite ignorant and unprepossessing. For some reason the match was broken off.

A son of Elkus got his elementary and high school education in St. Paul's Academy (?) an Episcopalian private school, one of the oldest in the city. The few Jewish boys who are admitted to that institution leave it as a rule as converts to Christianity because of the pressure that is brought to bear on them. Elkus' son was the first one in its history to be graduated as a Jew. Having had no Jewish contacts it is quite unlikely that he would marry a Jewess.

Mrs. Hess is a trustee of Columbia. Braunstein, the young man who is in charge of the Jewish work among the students, was referred to her by Miss Gildersleeve, the Dean of Barnard. After he spoke to her she mentioned his work to Hadas and expressed her approval of it. He wondered how she came to give her approval of work so definitely Jewish, but the mystery cleared when she explained to him that every time the girls at Barnard were given a tea, The Jewish girls made a bee line for the tea and cookies. She hoped that as a result of Braunstein's influence they would not be quite so unmannerly.

One of Mrs. Hess's brothers if Percy. The family has been anxious to get him into the diplomatic service. While the Hadas's were at Cincinnati they got word from Mrs. Hess that Percy was in the hospital undergoing an operation and she asked that they should visit him. When they got there Hadas saw that Percy had evidently been operated on the nose. At first he thought he was operated on for a case of sinus, but later he learned that the operation was for the purpose of straightening his nose so that it might not appear so Jewish. Percy hasn't as yet gotten into the diplomatic service, anyhow.

Hadas commented on the passionate ~~ex~~ energies of this type of Jew to get into Gentile society only to suffer repulse. A few Gentiles do patronize them but those are seldom of recognized social standing. There is always something wrong with the Gentiles who permit themselves to be cultivated by these Jews.

* * *

Thursday, July 24, 1930

For want of any one to discuss with some of my ideas on religion and Judaism I have resorted to writing out my thoughts in this journal. The chapter I wrote last summer on Torah as a Way of Life and the one I wrote a few weeks ago on the teaching of religion will find their place in Judaism as a Civilization though in considerably reorganized and amended form. I should like now to engage my ego and my alter in a discussion on the problem of all problems "Has life any meaning?"

I am interested just now in developing the thought that modern religion cannot accept any of the traditional solutions of the problem of evil, and must therefore try some new way out of the impasse. Otherwise religion hasn't a leg to stand on.

A. What do you understand by traditional solutions?

E. According to the traditional approach evil is subject to one of three possibilities. One possibility is that suffering serves no good whatever; a second is that a certain amount of good results but far too small to be accounted as a compensation for the suffering; and a third is that the good fully compensates for the suffering. Traditional theology has been hard at work proving that the third possibility is the actual one.

A. What's wrong with that?

E. It falls back on the old fallacy which maintained that if you could prove that evil is a means to good it is evil no longer. Even on the assumption that evil brings about good the question still remains why should suffering be necessary at all in the scheme of things? Could not the good have been achieved without suffering being a necessary means? I am aware of the reply you have in mind. You probably want to say that we could not appreciate anything as a good unless there were evil to offset it. This is sophistry. For the question may again be put Why is the mind so constituted that it needs suffering as a means

to the awareness of the good? The main weakness of the traditional theology is due to the fact that is assumes that God is perfect. On the assumption that the world is not only divine or if you will divinely governed, but that the God of the world is also perfect, nothing is gained even if we succeed in proving that the existence of evil is a means to overwhelming good. But perfection is in my opinion a perfectly useless and gratuitious conception which is responsible for the snarl in our thinking about religion. What I am interested in is not to prove that God is perfect that there is a God. It is immaterial to me whether He is perfect or not.

A. What do you gain by believing in God? if you are not sure that He is perfect? And how would your belief in God help you to deal with the problem of Evil?

E. Since I am interested merely in proving the existence of God the important concept for me is not perfection but meaning. I do not feel called upon to argue away the existence of evil. On the contrary from the standpoint of meaning, evil which serves as a background for good may be an actual necessity. Meaning demands contrasts.

A. You read this morning about the earthquake in Naples and the neighborhing sections of Italy where hundreds of lives were lost, thousands injured and many more thousands rendered homeless. You also read the long list of earthquakes in Japan, India, Protugal and Italy in which human beings by the myriads were crushed like flies. Do you want to imply that all that havoc was necessary in order to give meaning to your sheltered existence?

E. Now don't get indignant. I am only feeling my way. I am not making any dogmatic assertions, nor trying to come off easily. I want you to help me to think this through. Of the three possibilities I mentioned traditional theology has tried to prove that the last possibility corresponds to fact. It could do that because it knew so little

about the world and allowed its imagination to run away with it when it spoke of God. If you feel that in order to have religion God must be shown to be perfect then you must show that every evil is a means to good, or is compensated by some good. But I feel no such urge. In order that the world shall have meaning I do not need to assume that evil is a means to good or is more or less compensated for. What I have to be sure of is that the evil in the world shall be somewhat more than counterbalanced by the good. The evil instead of being a means to the good is merely an occasion. All that I have to be sure of is that the sum of existence is increasing in life and mind and not decreasing. If I can be sure that the direction in which Reality is moving is toward more order, more uniwueness and more love, than I am satisfied that Reality has meaning or pattern. It is that meaning or pattern which gives to Reality the character of godhood and which demands that my life fall in with it. This is what we understand by human life being spiritual.

A. This is too good to be true. At times you seem to be straining for gnats, and when it suits you you swallow whole camels. Do you think that I did not notice how you bootlegged an assumption which is no less pretentious than those you reject? You have assumed nothing less than the fact that in Reality there is more good than evil Since when have you become so expert a cosmic accountant as to be able to balance the good against the evil and in such a confidence strike a balance sheet in which good is on the credit side?

E. Please don't impute to me sins of which I am innocent. Did I not say "If I can be sure that the direction of Reality is such and such?" I am merely stating what I need to be sure of in order to have religion. In spite of your poking fun at my ability as a cosmic accountant I feel that I or any one with a sufficient knowledge of reality and a clear head could take cosmic stock much more readily than

prove that every evil is a means to some good. Which means that to have religion we merely have to satisfy a reasonable and not an unreasonable demand. This is a considerable gain on the traditional theology.

A. What warrant have you for saying that what you demand is capable of being supplied?

E. Because the mere fact that there is now more of life and mind than there was let us say during the ice age, should make it easy to prove that the world is not running down.

A. But what about the return of the ice age which the geologists foretell and the ultimate cooling of the sun that the astronomers prognosticate?

E. You can't squelch me with those prophecies. I can meet you on your own ground. If you want me to think in astronomical terms then I must set up the creation of new suns and new worlds to console us for the ultimate destruction of the one we belong to. I would advise you, however, to leave the dizzy spaces alone and come down to earth and see what the span of existence within our mental purview has to offer us on the question whether there is more than enough good in the world to counterbalance the evil.

A. I am impatient to know how you expect to proceed with your stock taking.

E. I hope you will not accuse me of juggling when I show you that the matter of stock taking is not as difficult as it seems. The reason it seems so overwhelmingly difficult to you is that you imagine I shall ask you to detach ourselves from our own lives and minds and stand as it were outside of the universe and then have some on reach over to us all the good things in it and all the evil while we keep piling them on the scales and watching which way the needle points. Dismiss that from your mind. That way of doing things was common with

theologians. They pretended they were able to rise mentally above Reality and take it all in with one glance, until we came along and proved to them they were only kidding themselves.

A. Now you've got me all puzzled. I suspect you are actually guilty of juggling the word you are afraid I'll charge you with.

E. I have purposely forwarned you so that you might be on the lookout for anything that is questionable. What I want to make plain to you is that in order to find whether or not the good counterbalances the evil it is neither necessary nor possible to detach yourself from yourself to do so. Whatever we think about the world is inevitably conditioned by our own needs. Why hide that fact? Rather make use of it openly and accept its consequences unprotestingly.

A. I still don't see what you are driving at.

E. The point is this. If you want to know whether the good counterbalances the evil ask yourself, Can human life be improved and enhanced despite all that we know of the evil which exists in the world? Is it possible for man to escape the dire consequences of such disasters as earthquakes and hurricances? There can be no question of his ability to overcome all man made evils. There is equally little doubt that with the application of intelligence there is no natural catastrophe against which he cannot protect himself. Man can not escape death but with the proper mental and physical equipment he can anesthetize himself against pain and the fear of death. If these things are possible then the world, that is, man's world which is afterall the only world he can know and care about, is so constituted that the measure of good more than counterbalances the measure of evil. A world so constituted can not be meaningless. Of course I realize that in asking you to contemplate the world, I am asking you not to limit your view to the past and present but to take into account the potentialities, the part of reality which is as yet beneath the horizon of actuality. But that

is just what the religions of the higher type have always been trying to get man to do with their messiahnism, otherworldliness and even mirvana.

A. You've talked a lot, but whether you've said anything I cannot tell just now. Let me think it over.

* * *

Wednesday, July 30, 1930

It appears that I have come to another turning point in the process of clarification in the following ideas:

Having reached the generalization that all religions in their manifold variety of self-expression have met the following four needs of the human being a) of controlling the physical environment, b) of discovering meaning in the cosmos, c) of achieving a sense of the supreme worth of personality and d) of being at home in the universe and finding meaning and worth in the civilization which supplies him with basis of personality or meaning in history, the next step is to point out that as a result of the challenge to religion the latter necessarily has entered upon a stage of self-consciousness, the effect of which is to become aware of the fact that the religions have functioned not only in meeting those needs, but meeting them in a spirit that treated those needs as interrelated organically, so that any one need cannot be met without the other. The attempt to ignore their organacity or to treat any one or two of them to the neglect or denial of the other needs always results in spiritual chaos and catastrophe. In other words, power faith salvation and loyalty which constitute the four satisfactions of the four needs that give rise to religion must form a pattern governing every act or thought that falls within the scope of any of the satisfactions.

* * *

Friday, August 1, 1930

The trouble with traditional religion is that it fails to distinguish between the language of fact and the language of aspiration. The statement that God is perfect if formulated accurately would read, "we want to find the world meaningful, and our place in it such as to give meaning to our lives." Traditional religion looks at the wrong end of the telescope. What we need is not a new philosophy of life but the proper code by which to decipher the eternal human quest in the various constructs called religions. The conventional approach consisted in proposing the assumption that there is a God and then spinning out of that assumption such qualities as we must affirm concerning Him. The typical inference that was thus spun out was that since God must be conceived as perfect otherwise he would not be God, and since perfection is inconceivable without existence therefore God necessarily exists. And so one quality after another. Such an absurd game (for such reasoning is nothing more than an intellectual ping-pong) can hardly be taken seriously. Instead therefore of the conventional approach, the question we should seek to answer is "What is the actual need which has led man to affirm the existence of God, and to what extent is that need or any other reflected in the honorific attributes man was in the habit of ascribing to God.

After having identified those needs and being assured that our wellbeing demands ~~xxx~~ reckoning with them the task of religion consists in pointing out how they may be satisfied - partly by ratiocination, but to a far greater degree by living on the assumption that the very existence of those needs implies that the world is inherently so constituted as to gratify them. To live on that assumption involves living a life of high idealism as articulated in the conscience of man's spiritual leaders. The art of religion ~~is~~ like the art of friendship. If I want to have a friend I do not first develop a theory about some

person that he possesses all the qualities that render his company desirable, only to find myself disappointed when actually meeting that person. Instead I am aware that my life demands the society of a person I can call my friend. I then proceed to make various overtures, act as friendly as I can toward the person whose friendship I wish to secure, and before I know it my purpose is attained.

* * *

Tuesday, August 12, 1930

In my thinking I have, like most indoor idealists, been playing with the idea of pacificism. I have often wished that Jewish religion might demand commitment to the pacifist cause. The following statement by William Lyon Phelps in The Christian Century of Aug. 6, 1930 places the question of commitment in a light I have never seen it before. "No one can read the future," he says. "No one knows when the next war will come or what kind of a war it will be. Therefore, I would not, as a Christian say now, that in the future I would never support war; for I do not know what circumstances may arise, circumstances where I might be forced to choose between two evils." Still the position of the Quakers deserves looking into.

I do not think I am so vain as to resent criticism. Nothing so bores me as unqualified praise of what I have said or written. Why, then, was I annoyed at the way Kadushin who stayed over the weekend in Long Branch and who spent some time reading my manuscript criticized some of the points developed in it? There is a certain note of captiousness in the way he states his opinions. It appears in his failure to get the full force of the point he criticizes, and more especially in his manner which betrays the apprehension that I do not like to hear any criticism.

As a matter of fact, I am very grateful to him for having called my attention to the unsatisfactory character of the chapter

which deals with the Kehillah. After some effort he succeeded in making himself clear as to what he thought was wrong with it. He maintained that I failed to take advantage of present day organization of Jewish life and tried to construct something entirely new and artificial. I admit that he is entirely right in his contention. This means that I have to rewrite that entire chapter.

* * *

Friday, August 15, 1930

We should make part of our national literature the two books of the Maccabees, Ben Simon and Philo's Commentaries.

* * *

Sunday, August 17, 1930

I experienced one of the greatest surprises of my life when I came across in the CCAR report the following answer to a questionnaire sent to Reform Rabbis in 1925-26.

"Is the trend toward placing less emphasis on Judaism as a cult and more emphasis on Judaism as a civilization, i.e. identifying it with all the activities and relations of life?"

	North	South	West	Total
Cult	3	8	4	15
Civilization	20	12	18	50

Yearbook Central Conference, American Rabbis

1926 - p. 320.

* * *

Monday, August 18, 1930

I'm restive, jumpy, irritable. I get this way as soon as I find myself confronted by the task of having to think through a situation anew after having dealt with it in the superficial manner which one must perforce employ in a popular address. After all the work that I put into the chapter on Jewish education I find that it is all